

Application No.: 09/881,393
Amendment dated: April 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of: October 22, 2004

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated October 22, 2004. The claims that are pending in this case are claims 22-29, all of which have been effectively amended here by amendment of the independent claims 22, 23, 24 and 26. Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the present form of the claims and the following comments.

As currently presented, the claims here are deemed to reflect an operator-supported system for accumulating data, as for subsequent expedient processing. For example, a form of this system is described in the specification at pages 5, 15 and 18. In philosophy and operation, the system is quite distinct from those of the applied references based on the distinctions considered below.

The claimed system involves effectively serving callers who may or may not have current standing. For callers with current standing, data is taken, flagged and recorded for subsequent processing. However, for callers without current standing, identification data is first received and stored. Thus, the system has a continually growing customer base.

Other significant aspects are also involved in the operation of the system. Specifically, the system receives caller identification data, in response to cueing, records significant information, transfers to an operator with display and data-entry capability and finally, provides confirmation. These aspects are also recited in the current claims.

In structure, philosophy and operation, the total system is quite distinct from the combinations of the references that are asserted. Furthermore, the claims clearly specify various distinct operations as in 1) flagging data for processing, 2) recording data "*as additional data for said individual caller,*" and 3) individual data packets or files.

Application No.: 09/881,393
Amendment dated: April 20, 2005
Reply to Office Action of: October 22, 2004

Turning to the references that are asserted, De Bruyn may discuss player selection (page 6, line 28), however, it does not appear to suggest exercising control to selectively record caller identification number signals as well as digital data signals. Furthermore, there appears to be no suggestion of flagging data for subsequent processing. Szlam teaches receiving a caller's telephone number, but does not appear to teach the selectivity nor the flagging aspects that are claimed.

Recognizing that the additional references, that is, Entenmann, Stephenson, and Barger may disclose certain component elements, adding any of them to the primary references do not yield the claimed aspects that are explained above.

Respectfully, Applicant urges the Examiner to reconsider her rejections in view of the arguments urged above.

Favorable consideration and allowance of the claims pending here is respectfully requested.

Dated: 4/20/2005

9255 Sunset Blvd., Suite 810
Los Angeles, CA 90069
(310) 247-2860

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830